

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 690

UD 018 952

TITLE Toward a Language Policy for Puerto Ricans in the United States: An Agenda for a Community in Movement.

SPONS AGENCY City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Centro de Estudios Pertorriguenos.; Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.

PUB DATE 77

NOTE 112p.; Not available in hard copy due to reproduction quality of the original document; For a related document, see UD 018 950 ; Document prepared by the National Puerto Rican Task Force on Educational Policy

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; *Bilingualism; Community Influence; *Community Role; Court Cases; Educational Improvement; Educational Legislation; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Language Instruction; Political Issues; *Puerto Ricans; Social Factors; Spanish

ABSTRACT

This document asserts that historical, legal, demographic, and other forces indicate that language issues will be a primary focus of future policy contention. Economic formations, demographic movements, class assignments, and political organizations are described as they shape the relationship between language, education, and community identity. This relationship is used in examining the role bilingualism plays in education and in community identity. Also examined are legislative decisions affecting bilingualism and the potential of politics and society in securing the future of bilingual education. Federal, State and local level activities which could act to bring about educational approaches reflecting the Puerto Rican community's needs and values are suggested. Utilization of the potential strengths, present capacities, and untapped resources of the Puerto Rican community in achieving the desired language goals is called for. A Puerto Rican Education and Language Research Institute is proposed for furthering language planning and community development around language and education concerns. In addition, strategies for developing an adequate data base on the Puerto Rican school situation in the United States are suggested. Appendices include a brief history of and list of participants in the National Puerto Rican Task Force on Educational Policy, a description of Public Law 94-311, suggested for updating 1970 census figures for local Puerto Rican populations, and an educational profiles study questionnaire prepared by Aspira of America. (Author/EB)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED164690

TOWARD A LANGUAGE POLICY FOR PUERTO RICANS IN THE UNITED STATES:

AN AGENDA FOR A COMMUNITY

IN MOVEMENT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Centro de Estudios
Puerto Riqueños

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

National Puerto Rican Task Force
on Educational Policy

1977

U0018952

Copyright ©, RESEARCH FOUNDATION
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
1977

**Toward a Language Policy for Puerto Ricans in the United States:
An Agenda For A Community In Movement**

Contents

Foreword

Part I: Components of a Language Policy

- A. The Policy Context**
- B. Education, Language and Bilingualism**
 - 1. Bilingualism and Education
 - 2. Bilingualism and Community Identity
 - 3. Bilingualism and the Law
 - 4. Bilingualism, Politics and Social Transformation
- C. A Tentative Statement of Language Goals**
- D. Education for Bilinguality: Unifying School and Community**

Part II: Suggested Lines for Action

Part III: Toward an Adequate Data Base on the Puerto Rican School Situation in the United States

- Appendices:**
- A. The National Puerto Rican Task Force on Educational Policy: A Brief History and List of Participants**
 - B. Public Law 94-311**
 - C. Suggestions For Updating 1970 Census Figures for Local Puerto Rican Populations**
 - D. Selected List From the 1975 Directory of State Registrars**
 - E. Puerto Rican Educational Profiles Study Questionnaire: Aspira of America**

Foreword

This report presents the basic components of a language policy for Puerto Ricans in the United States. A clear and coherent language policy is essential to any effective action on the fundamental educational issues confronting Puerto Ricans today. This is especially so since language has become a major and disputed tool in bilingual programs designed to "solve" the educational problems of Puerto Ricans.

The analysis and proposals advanced in this report are intended to pose language policy issues as clearly as is now possible. Our hope is that they will serve as a framework for much needed dialogue and debate among Puerto Rican communities throughout the country, stimulating collective thinking and providing an agenda for action.

The report summarizes the work of the National Puerto Rican Task Force on Educational Policy, a group of Puerto Rican educators, social scientists, lawyers and community advocates from various parts of the country who have been actively involved in educational issues in our local communities. This group came together as a task force in 1975 to begin a systematic review of the educational policy needs of Puerto Ricans in the U.S. (Refer to Appendix A). The present document thus has its roots in shared experiences and frustrations as members of a national minority seeking to play a meaningful role in shaping research and policy affecting our community. In encounter upon encounter with

national institutions and federal agencies responsible for policies and programs having a major impact on Puerto Ricans, we have all met with indifference, misinformation and the simple refusal to seriously consider our community's repeated demands and assessments concerning educational needs.

In May of 1974, in what proved to be a turning point for the group, individual members of the Task Force were convened by the National Institute of Education of HEW to advise them on educational policies for Puerto Ricans. After several fruitless meetings with NIE and submission of a policy statement including very specific recommendations, no action was ever taken by the agency, nor minimal commitments made, thus repeating a pattern of neglect and resistance common to most federal agencies when dealing with Puerto Ricans - a pattern that remains unchanged. The experience highlighted the futility of sporadic attempts at dialogue with agencies moved by narrow self-interest and public relations concerns. It reaffirmed our conviction that in order to affect program or policy development, a sustained, concerted dialogue must take place among concerned Puerto Ricans looking toward an educational research and policy agenda based on the community's own sense of direction, needs and priorities.

Thus the National Puerto Rican Task Force on Educational Policy came into being, and with a small grant from the Ford Foundation and support from the Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños (City University of New York) worked over an eighteen month period. This report is

the product of that effort. It places before the many Puerto Rican communities in the U.S. a framework for discussing pressing educational issues, some understanding of the most immediate areas of need (language policy and bilingual programs) along with a proposal for the continuation of dialogue and planning among ourselves. The ultimate objective is that out of this process will come a policy statement that reflects the educational aspirations and visions of the Puerto Rican community nation-wide providing at the same time an organized basis for movement in that direction. It is our hope that other language minorities in the nation, Hispanic and non-Hispanic, will be moved to enter into this dialogue and find common cause in the struggle for educational rights in which we are engaged.

Part I

Components of a Language Policy

A. The Policy Context

Sound policy rests on accurate knowledge, strong theory and adequate command of the means of action in a planned process. But, of course, such favorable conditions for articulating a policy are rarely given. In the present instance, the lack of information and the precariousness of our knowledge concerning essential processes and our control over resources are particularly glaring. Therefore, a real question arises as to whether it is appropriate to label as a "policy" any set of actions linked to language preferences or goals that we can now state. Yet we believe that the time has come for Puerto Ricans in the United States to speak out in direct terms about some of the hard choices that lie before us concerning language and education. Thus, we invoke the term "policy" advisedly, moving from the premise that a coherent statement of language related goals and actions for Puerto Ricans is now necessary and possible, and that these can only emanate from within our own community.

Our judgement that the articulation of language related goals and actions is now both necessary and possible is conditioned by the following considerations:

1. By all indications Puerto Rican migration to the United States will continue at substantial levels over the coming decades. This migration

is increasingly dispersed over the United States. Migration is now for many Puerto Ricans a way of life rather than single life transforming experience. More and more Puerto Ricans alternate periods of residence in various parts of the U.S. with stays of varying duration in Puerto Rico. These patterns of alternation and circulation have yet to be closely studied. In point of fact, natural increase now adds more to the Puerto Rican population living in the U.S. than does migration, but those born here are also part of the complex migration flows. Thus, the language needs and preferences of this growing community are increasingly projected to the national level as a distinct dimension within a complex of policy issues related to education, work, social planning and political action.

2. The vigor of Spanish as a major first or second language among U.S. residents is evidenced in many ways. Spanish is the principal language other than English learned and spoken in the home; the Hispanic origin community is the fastest growing minority in the country with an increasing number of important regional concentrations. The reaffirmation of national identity by Hispanics lends an unparalleled thrust to the current movement for bilingual education which is flowing over into the

affirmation of language rights in politics (voter registration and balloting), demands for government services and employment in both the public and private sector, as well as the mass media and entertainment. The legal and institutional base of this linguistic affirmation is gradually being consolidated. Knowledge of Spanish remains a practical necessity in effective organizational and institutional activity at every level and is a concrete link to a richly creative intellectual and political tradition that is world-wide in scope. The number of young, college trained professionals, business, government and service workers whose command of Spanish is an essential qualification for employment and job advance is also growing. Spanish competence will remain a vital feature of life in U.S. communities for decades to come.

3. Throughout its history in the U.S. the Puerto Rican community has asserted its collective identity and sought to build and control its own institutions locally. Thus as the issues affecting Puerto Ricans are thrust into the national policy arena, we can expect that appropriate organizational bases will be constructed. Seen in this light, the Task Force producing this document is only one of many improvised structures meeting this need in an interim way.

4. At stake are not merely the educational or language rights of Puerto Ricans, but also the very fiber and legal foundations of political association in the U.S., and especially the role of the federal government and courts in protecting the rights of minority peoples. More specifically, what is at issue is the content that can be given in the U.S. to such concepts as "linguistic or cultural pluralism" with reference to those minorities that are racially stigmatized, overwhelmingly working class in composition, and have a common experience of colonial domination by the U.S.
5. Mass bilingualism as a late feature of advanced colonialism, the transnational movement of investment, and the massive migration of workers from formerly colonized regions to metropolitan centers emerges in the last two decades as a new historical phenomenon of global import. The Puerto Rican case thus acquires added significance as a particularly developed instance of prolonged language interaction and struggle within an evolving and conflictful socio-economic and political framework.

In brief, our knowledge of demographic trends, the history of Puerto Rico and our community in the United States, the constitutional and legal issues raised by thrust of linguistic or ethnic claims in

this country, as well as the changing configuration of capitalist production on a world scale all lead us to believe that language issues will constitute a primary focus of policy contention in the next few decades. As a community whose survival may hang in the balance, we must strive for a realistic sense of the full complexity of the processes involved and for reasoned judgments about desired outcome and lines of action within our reach.

B. Education, Language and Bilingualism

Although a great deal of information is needed to provide a fuller picture of the educational circumstances and conditions of Puerto Ricans in the U.S., the available data demonstrate unequivocally both the dimensions of the educational crisis confronting Puerto Ricans and the massive failure of the school systems in the U.S. to educate Puerto Rican children.

According to the 1970 Census, fewer than two percent of Puerto Ricans in the U.S. 25 to 44 years old had completed a college education - about the same percentage as in 1950 and 1960. At the same time, only one in four Puerto Rican adults had completed high school, while more than one-quarter of these adults were high school drop-outs. Most of the rest ended formal education without graduating from elementary school. Although the 1970 Census showed a gain for Puerto Ricans of almost two years in the median number of years of school completed since 1950, this gain was due primarily to a shift from elementary school attainment to partial high school attainment, and not to an increase in the high school completion rate, which has remained proportionately the same since 1950.

The figures for key groups in the school-age population are even more revealing about the educational experience of Puerto Rican students.

A report prepared by ASPIRA of America¹ looked at enrollment levels compared to the ages of students as recorded in the 1970 Census. It found that among Puerto Ricans 14 to 17 years old approximately 40 per cent were still in elementary grades, compared with a figure of 17 per cent for persons enrolled at equivalent ages in the total U.S. population. This "delayed education" problem was not limited to children born in Puerto Rico. Among Puerto Rican students in that age group who were born in the U.S., 32 per cent were still in elementary grades, and 41 per cent were at least one year behind the normal age-grade schedule. Furthermore, this problem has a "ripple effect," continuing to manifest itself at later ages. For example, among those Puerto Ricans 18 to 24 years old who were enrolled in school, more than 60 per cent were still in high school, compared with 9 per cent for the total U.S. student population at equivalent ages. And the figures for those Puerto Ricans born in the U.S. were not much different: 56 per cent of the 18 to 24 year-olds enrolled in school were still in high school.

This same report related the "delayed education" phenomenon to the drop-out problem. Using a more age-sensitive indicator of dropping-out, it calculated drop-out rates for the 16 to 18 and 19 to 24 age groups in 11 metropolitan areas. Thus, it was found, for example,

1. Social Factors in Educational Attainment Among Puerto Ricans in U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1970, New York. 1976. The figures in this section are almost entirely drawn from that report.

that the drop-out rate for 16 to 18 year-olds was 80 per cent in Boston, 21 per cent in New York, 31 per cent in Philadelphia and 28 per cent in Chicago, while the respective rates for the 19 to 24 age group in these same cities were 65, 54, 77, and 61 per cent!

These statistics only partially reveal the reality that has led Puerto Ricans throughout the U.S. to challenge the educational system and demand more sensitive and responsive pedagogical strategies. For a number of reasons language and related issues have come to occupy a central place in these efforts. By and large, English language "deficiencies" have been most often cited by school authorities as the reason why so many Puerto Rican students do poorly in school. Given the dynamics of the migration process and the structural placement of Puerto Ricans in U.S. society, many of us do come to the schools bearing a language repertoire which is different from that which is used in the schools. Whether and to what extent, alleged language difficulties account for the quality of the Puerto Rican educational experience is, to say the least, problematic. The ASPIRA research that has been mentioned, for example, identifies a variable combining poverty and recency of migration along with the Spanish origin community's numerical strength in a community as principal facts explaining delayed schooling among Puerto Ricans in their early teens. What is clear to Puerto Ricans is that the language/languages that they bring to the school are looked down upon, downgraded and even forbidden or excluded from the teaching process. This dynamic, together with the widespread recognition that the acquisition of language skills and proficiency is critical to success

in school, helps explain why language has been at the heart of the Puerto Rican response to the educational crisis.

More specifically, the major thrust of our community's response to this crisis has been a call for bilingual and bicultural education. This initiative, which seeks to build a program of quality education based upon linguistic, pedagogical and cultural realities heretofore ignored, has moved across our community with great speed and impact. Thus, the questions of language and bilingualism now seem to dominate the treatment given to educational and cultural questions. However, it is necessary to recognize that while language plays an important role in the educational process, it cannot prudently be assumed to be the primary factor. Language itself is shaped by many forces, and the question of the relationship between language, education and community identity rests at the center of a complex cluster of elements that includes, but is not limited to, economic formations, demographic movements, class alignments and political organization.

This means that present efforts toward developing a language "policy" must build carefully on the positive values and practices derived from past and ongoing struggles in this arena. The formulation of a full and effective language policy is a very difficult endeavor. The experiences of developing nations and national minorities elsewhere, for example, indicate that even under the most favorable conditions

the formulation and execution of a language policy is filled with uncertainty.²

Therefore, as we approach this task for Puerto Ricans in the U.S. we should be continuously aware of the scope of research and action that will be required in order to realize language goals. These include:

1. Development of a complete description and analysis of the uses of the competing and correlated linguistic systems actually coexisting in the community.
2. Development of a description and analysis of the factors affecting language attitudes.
3. Selection of political, pedagogical and linguistic goals based on a scientific evaluation of the community's reality, particularly in terms of such factors as class, literacy, identity and cultural expression.
4. Development of materials, programs and institutions that will effectively support and reinforce these decisions.

In short, stating a tentative policy is but a first step in a massive drive of organization and institution building that must be

2. Joan Rubin and Bjoir H. Jernudd (eds.), Can Language Be Planned?, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1971.

undertaken in notably unpromising conditions. Many nations and groups have instituted language policies at different stages of knowledge and readiness. All have had to face the full range of concerns sketched here. In the specific instance of Puerto Ricans in the U.S., it will be useful to begin by reviewing some major fronts of reflection and struggle over language that have shaped our understanding of this question most dramatically. These are:

Bilingualism and education

Bilingualism and community identity

Bilingualism and the law

Bilingualism, political movement
and transformation

Bilingualism and Education

Language is central to the process of education. Yet even with respect to the monolingual child, there are questions surrounding the role of language forms, linguistic comprehension, and language interaction that are currently being investigated and debated. This discussion has only recently generated sustained and broad research and is not yet informed by a treatment of the needs of the bilingual child. Moreover, the bilingual education movement has moved through curriculum planning, program development, materials production, teacher training and testing, with little knowledge of the effects of bilinguality upon language acquisition and cognitive development. Thus, one of the primary needs of education in general, and bilingual education in

particular, is a detailed understanding of the role of language in the learning process.

How do bilingual children learn languages? How do they transfer skills from one language into the other? What teaching methods best serve the cognitive styles of bilingual children? These are some of the questions that require attention and investigation. We also need to know about our children's strengths and about the skills in the non-standard dialects that may be transferable in the initial teaching of standard forms. Similarly, when we speak about the incorporation of culture into the classroom, we need to understand what this means in practical terms. Can culture be taught? If so, how? How closely bound are cultures and languages?

Despite the sweep and significance of these unanswered questions, we can safely affirm the importance of bilingual-bicultural education as it is presently conceived for many Puerto Rican children, for it has afforded Spanish-speaking children the opportunity to make use of their culture and language inside the classrooms of the dominant Anglo culture. This educational strategy must, however, be deepened through research, teacher training, community participation, and resource development. At the same time, we should realize that a different order of questions and issues are generated when bilingualism is considered as a goal and a set of competences to be sustained rather than as an obstacle to education. Some of these issues are considered in a following section.

Bilingualism and Community Identity

In order to gain some control over language and its impact in our community, we need to gather critical linguistic knowledge as well as understanding of the relationship between language issues and the political and economic relationships they express. Specifically, we need to know what language forms are used for communication in our community. This requires that we describe the standard and dialect forms encountered, detail the particular traits and styles of these systems, and correlate this information with attitudinal and political factors in the community. It is also important to know how various linguistic modes are perceived by community members so that we can understand the political consequences of choosing one form over another. The most dramatic instance of this problematic is the ongoing contention over the widespread phenomena of "code switching" and "word borrowing" and their implications for the existence of various U.S. dialects of Puerto Rican English or Spanish.

Already available evidence suggests that the language practice of the Puerto Rican community is a complex mosaic that eludes description in terms of a simple spectrum running from English speakers on the one end to Spanish speakers on the other. Instead, among the Puerto Rican speakers, "English" itself may (and does) take the form of standard English, standard New York City (or other area) English, Black non-standard English and Puerto Rican non-standard English. Similarly,

with respect to "Spanish" we can distinguish between the standard form, the popular or vernacular form, and perhaps, even such regionally evolving forms as New York City Spanish, for example.

It is important to bear in mind that the debate over language forms to be used in education reflects a deeper conflict over values and cultural forms as these are projected into the future. The choice of any one of these forms for education necessarily implies differential attention to, and reinforcement of, the cultural modes, communication patterns and expressive forms of different sectors of the community. At the same time, it should be noted that bilinguality is needed not only for effective communication between members of the community and the "outside world," as it were, but also for communication within the community itself. We should also be clear that the existence or the maintenance of bilinguality is not the same thing as retention of the language of the parents. While languages and language forms are constantly coming into existence and passing away in ways and for reasons that are still not very clear, there is evidence that the factors associated with the successful acquisition of a second language are different from those which make for retention and successful transmission from one generation to another of the first language of parents.³ Our opening remarks in the section on the policy context

3. Stanley Lieberman, Language and Ethnic Relations in Canada, Toronto: John Wiley & Sons, 1970.

sets forth our grounds for believing that those necessary conditions will be present in the U.S. over the next two or three decades.

Bilingualism and the Law

Bilingualism has never been articulated as an official policy of the United States. Historically, public schools have functioned under an assimilationist ideal, at times articulated and at times not, but nevertheless very real in both instances. Until the development of large schooling bureaucracies at the state level in the late 19th century, immigrant groups which were clustered in large numbers in certain areas of the country were able to obtain bilingual instruction, (and at times monolingual in their language) at the local level. Thus, Ohio and Wisconsin passed legislation allowing German to be used as the language of instruction in the 1830's and 1840's.

In the West and Southwest, Spanish was used as one of the languages of instruction in many school districts. Indeed, the Treaty of Guadalupe - Hidalgo, signed in 1848, stipulated the right of former Mexican citizens, in the territories taken over by the U.S., to maintain their language and culture in the private and the public spheres.

Around the turn of the century, in part as a xenophobic reaction to the steady tide of non-English speaking immigrants from southern and eastern Europe, the push to Americanize at all costs and as quickly as possible began to gather strength in many intellectual and political circles. By the early 1900's a number of state legislatures had

enacted laws calling for English-only instruction in public schools, although foreign languages could still be taught as specific subjects. In effect, bilingual education was forbidden. In the early 1920's legislation was enacted in Nebraska to extend the state's English-only law to private schools, but the U.S. Supreme Court ruled it unconstitutional. The passage by Congress in 1924 of the National Origins Act, which set very rigid quotas on immigration from southern and eastern Europe and Asia while allowing generous numbers of immigrants from northern and western Europe, perhaps symbolizes the culmination of the xenophobia of that period, and clearly reflected the nation's mood favoring assimilation at a fast pace.

In 1958 Congress, spurred by Russia's Sputnik launch in 1957, passed the National Education Defense Act. This legislation, which categorized the teaching of science, math and languages as being in the interest of the nation's defense, marked what might be considered the first attempt by Congress to delineate a language policy.

In the early 60's the arrival of thousands of Cuban exiles motivated the creation of bilingual education programs in the Miami (Florida) area. The study of the problems faced by Mexican American students in southwestern states conducted by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in the mid-60's, dramatized for the entire nation and Congress the educational plight of Chicanos. A Puerto Rican study in the late 50's had done something similar, albeit on a smaller scale, in New York City and parts of the East Coast.

By 1966 the first organized efforts began to gather momentum, and bilingual education emerged as the rallying cry for several groups. In 1968 hearings on proposed legislation were conducted by Congress. In 1969 the Bilingual Education Act was approved and signed into law as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The law clearly carried a compensatory framework, given its remedial intent to address English language "deficiencies". Federal allocations began at the modest level of \$7,500,000 for 1969 and increased steadily every year to more than \$100 million in 1977.

In 1971, stimulated by the example set by Congress, Massachusetts became the first state to pass legislation which mandated school districts with 20 or more children of limited English ability to provide transitional bilingual education programs for them. Other states quickly followed Massachusetts' example and transitional bilingual education legislation of different sorts, mandatory or simply permissive, was enacted in Texas, California, Illinois and many other states. State funds were thus added to federal monies and the expansion of bilingual education was well on its way.

Parallel to legislative development in bilingual education was the growing use of the courts as forums for the resolution of legal questions raised relative to violations of the civil and constitutional rights of non-English speaking students. The struggles of blacks for desegregated education opened the way for the discussion on whether or not equal access by itself would provide equality of educational

opportunity and equal benefits from the schooling experience to the non-English speaking student. This led the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) to issue its now renowned May 25, 1970 Memorandum which states in part:

When inability to speak and understand the English language excludes national origin-minority group children from effective participation in the educational program offered by a school district, the district must take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open its instructional program to these students.

The content of this Memorandum and HEW's authority to formulate such guidelines, were later upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974).

Meanwhile, as a result of a series of suits by Mexican American parents in the Southwest, the courts started to define the rights of Hispanic students in public schools for purposes of equal protection and to fashion remedies that would correct violations of these rights and allow a smoother path towards equality of educational opportunity. Thus, in Cisneros v. Corpus Christi much attention was given to the consideration of Hispanics as an identifiable ethnic minority group for purposes of desegregation and designing a remedy that would include programs aimed at meeting their educational needs, namely bilingual education. In U.S. v. Texas (San Felipe del Rio), 342 F. Supp. 24 (E.D. Texas, 1971), *affd. per curiam*, 466 F. 2d 518 (1972), the court went farther in ordering a comprehensive bilingual instructional

program for Mexican children. This was also the case in Serna v. Portales, 499 F. 2d 1147 (1974), where based on the precedent of Lau, a finding of violation was made under Title VI, section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in view of the district's reluctance to provide bilingual instruction. The consent decree in Aspira v. Board of Education, New York (1974), where the agreement signed with the district resulted in one of the largest bilingual programs in the country, was based on the same precedents.

In Keyes v. School District No. 1 (Denver), for the first time the Supreme Court upheld a district decision that placed Hispanic students under a broader category of "minority". This was most significant since it potentially affected school desegregation cases in other cities with multi-ethnic populations, where a third group was "numerically significant" to be considered separately in devising court-ordered remedies. In a subsequent decision in Keyes, 521 F.2d 465 (1975), the Court of Appeals established that "bilingual education is not a substitute for desegregation" and stated that, when the two come in conflict, desegregation takes precedence over bilingual education. However, the Court also appeared to endorse the concept that "a meaningful desegregation plan" must help "hispano school children to reach the proficiency in English necessary to learn other basic subjects," since on remand it ordered that evidence be brought forth to clarify the extent of need for children of limited English language skills in the district and that, once identified, steps be taken to address this need.

Perhaps the best known decision pertaining to the educational needs of children in public schools who have limited or no English language skills is the January 1974 U.S. Supreme Court case, Lau v. Nichols. While this decision did not explicitly endorse bilingual education (or any other method of instruction), it was perceived by many groups and individuals to be a major victory in the struggle to obtain equal educational opportunity through bilingual education. More importantly, it had significant impact in promoting the adoption by various state legislatures of statutes mandating or allowing bilingual instruction in public schools.⁴

Although Lau is the most quoted precedent, other cases dealing with bilingual education had been decided prior to Lau and some have followed it, particularly in urban school districts where school desegregation is often a major issue. But Lau has two major limitations when viewed from legal and pedagogical perspectives. Legally, the basis for the Lau decision rests with the Court's interpretation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits (among other things), discrimination on the basis of national origin. Language was included under this broad category. Therefore, rights of students under Lau were found to be statutory rights, not constitutional rights. Pedagogically, the emphasis on a deficit model ("language deficiencies")

4. The Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1974 represents the codification of Lau by Congress. Under Section 1703, (f) this law identifies as discriminatory "the failure by an educational agency to take approaches necessary to overcome language barriers that impeded equal participation by its students in its instructional program." (20 U.S.C.)

for which special programming must be provided, places bilingual education squarely within a compensatory education frame of reference, along with many other programs for the "culturally disadvantaged." This stigma is often carried over into the schools and classrooms within those schools where bilingual programs exist, making it difficult and in many instances impossible for the program to be viewed as a quality, enriching experience for students.

Shortly after Lau, the Education Amendments to the ESEA were discussed, debated and approved by Congress, and Title VII's appropriation was increased significantly. Dozens of language groups were included in the programs funded and bilingual education seemed finally well-established as a policy at both federal and state levels.

Recently, the potential conflict between bilingual education and school desegregation has come to the forefront in educational debates. The debate on school desegregation in major urban areas in the north, west and northwest has been expanded to include bilingual education and its potential role in preventing full desegregation from taking place. Existing legal precedents are unclear in this regard. Although the right of children of limited English language skills to special instruction to address their particular needs has been affirmed by a unanimous Supreme Court in Lau, the same court in January 1976 let stand the decision of the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals in Keyes which assigned a role of secondary importance to bilingual education in a desegregation plan.

The controversy over bilingual education continues unabated and, as the ESEA amendments for 1978 are discussed by Congress, the mood of Congress about the direction and scope of bilingual education is not clear and appears somewhat different from what it was in 1974.

Several developments seem to account in large part for this change in mood. First, an evaluation report critical of selected bilingual education programs prepared by the American Institutes of Research has generated some doubts and much debate about the merits and efficacy of bilingual education, as measured by achievement scores in math, language arts, and English. Although its methodology has been seriously questioned, many groups opposing bilingual education have seized upon it as a weapon of attack. Other critics have questioned the role of the federal government in promoting bilingual education and what they perceive to be federal support for "affirmative ethnicity." Lastly, the specter of separatism has been raised with Quebec and Canada frequently used as a prime example of what the political impact of bilingualism can produce. Various major newspapers (New York Times, Washington Post, Milwaukee Journal, Detroit Free Press, to name but a few) have issued editorials condemning any form of bilingual education which is not transitional, i.e., which does not aim at the speediest transition from the use of the student's native language into English-only instruction, with no attention paid to developing and/or maintaining the child's skills in his/her first language. Undoubtedly, such critics are struggling to ensure that earlier official/government perceptions

as to the functions of bilingual education be kept and that no deviation from its assimilationist goal be allowed.

The prospects for bilingualism to be assured through legal means appear highly improbable given existing precedents, both legislative as well as judicial. It may be that the future of bilingualism in the United States will be decided on other grounds - political struggles, demographic changes due to immigration ("legal" and illegal") and changes in the international sphere, which will move Congress and the English-speaking majority from its ethnocentric and at times linguistically chauvinistic posture towards a more pluralistic stance. This would imply, among other things, a clearer acceptance of other languages and cultures as an integral part of life and society in the United States.

Bilingualism, Politics and Social Transformation

Bilingual education is at a critical point in its development. The next few years will determine whether it will remain a viable, long-lasting addition to U.S. education or whether it will go the way of anti-poverty programs, Model Cities, Headstart, and the like. At this time the space cleared by these programs has created an environment that is responsive to social science knowledge and pedagogical expertise. Ever more apparent is a casting about for leadership and direction with political clarity.

The next few years will be critical because they may determine what kind of social change bilingual education will produce within the minority communities of the U.S. Our impression is that most of the Hispanics currently involved in bilingual education (teachers, para-professionals, administrators) are still closely tied to their communities. However, we should be alert to the development of a narrow professionalism that may not necessarily respond to community interests. The political role of the bilingual educator bears stressing. This is most important in schools or districts where bilingual programs have been developed in spite of the opposition and hostility of administrators and teacher unions. The bilingual educator must be a political advocate for the movement and an informed interpreter of his community's needs.

Unlike other educational reforms, such as school decentralization, community control, ethnic studies and open admissions, all established in the late 1960's in response to societal pressures, bilingual education is still a growing movement, Federal support over the last decade has been significant. However, this legal and programmatic support for bilingual education from the federal government (and now an increasing number of state governments) will not by itself insure the success or continuation of these programs. Although most people are aware that support from the affected communities is essential, Dr. Joshua Fishman, for example, one of the leading sociolinguists in the United States, has pointed out that acceptance by the majority community is also critical to the long term survival of these programs. In fact, he characterizes bilingual education as the next major reform movement in American education and he proposes that the rationale for it shift from the transitional-maintenance debate to one of cultural enrichment. Still, it is a fact that bilingual education faces local and national opposition. Thus winning acceptance by the majority community is a key to securing the future of bilingual education. Available policy must not only rally Puerto Ricans and other Hispanics but also make a persuasive appeal to the conscience and good sense of other thoughtful and open-minded persons.

C. A Tentative Statement of Language Goals

In pressing for the tentative formulation of a language policy, it should be clear that we are not assigning primacy to language as a lever of action or as a source of problems in our community. On the contrary, we see basic economic processes, especially trends in the volume and composition of migration flows and the resultant economic and social placement of Puerto Ricans as setting the decisive context in which language changes will continue to be played out. Key trends in this connection have already been noted.

It should also be very clear that we are proposing a language policy for Puerto Ricans in the U.S. An important part of the context for such a policy are the language goals and related actions, especially in education, of Puerto Ricans in the homeland, other Hispanics in the U.S. and U.S. educational authorities.

1. We take Puerto Rico's policy of universal instruction in Spanish with English as a second language to be working there in the direction of generalized bilingualism with Spanish dominance. The growing importance and extended command of English suggest the need to be attentive to this situation as a point of equilibrium or possible crossover to English dominance approaches. Of particular concern would be the role of return migrants in maintaining or tipping such a balance.

2. In tentatively stating a language policy for Puerto Ricans we do not presume to speak for other Hispanics in the United States. Though we believe unity in the struggle around language issues is essential, not only among Hispanics but with all excluded minorities, we are very conscious of basic differences and the need for each community to move in its own way through the process of defining a policy position.
3. The liberal movement in U.S. education toward language and cultural pluralism is patently based on concerns with equity, efficiency and enrichment in education. It has no stock in the language rights broadly of U.S. minorities nor with the rights of such groups to control educational decisions for their children. A language policy for Puerto Ricans will have little meaning unless it is amplified to other institutional fronts and broadens the base for our affirmation and struggle in the U.S.

Concretely, then, we propose the following as language goals and policy principles for Puerto Ricans in the U.S. over the next ten to fifteen years. As an agenda for discussion, the statement is long on goals and short on details of action. Some of the many conditions required to make viable the pursuit of these goals are spelled out in pages that follow.

1. We propose that bilinguality should become a self-consciously articulated goal for our community in The U.S. By this we do not mean a community with a mix of English and Spanish speakers but a community in which as many as possible acquire competence in both languages. Implicit in this idea of bilinguality is the idea of mother tongue retention. This means not merely "maintenance" of Spanish for native speakers but the passing along of both languages to their offspring by bilinguals.
2. To frame a policy means not just to choose a language but also some language standard. Educationally, our goal should be spoken and written command of the standard dialect in Spanish and English. This does not mean a downgrading or rejection of other dialects, vernaculars or linguistic combinations in education or other settings.
3. Framing a policy also means defining educational strategies, especially languages of instruction. It is here that we see the greatest flexibility, openness and sensitivity to local needs as necessary. It is at this level that constructive solutions must appear in terms of the schools' use (aprovechamiento) of the language resources the community brings to it and the returns in language growth and vitalization the community can draw from the

school.

4. Such a policy must project action in extra school contexts and institutions in ways that are responsive to the richness of language events and combinations already perceptible in expanding areas of Puerto Rican life (poetry, theatre, professional and organizational arenas).

D. Education for Bilinguality: Unifying School and Community

Bilingualism as a sustained goal for our community in the United States raises an unprecedented order of questions and issues. Two oft-forgotten principles should be firmly kept in the foreground:

1. The school plays only a partial albeit an important role in the education of our children.
2. Our children are not only inherently capable of acquiring a full command of two languages but are in fact communicating in multiple language forms infrequently understood, recognized or utilized by the schools.

To expand the notion of education beyond the school and at the same time focus on the strengths of our young will require a radical readjustment of educational practice. This radical readjustment entails the combined efforts of the school and community. The school reaching out, recognizing, promoting, fostering, and incorporating educational activity in the community. The community, in turn asserting itself, questioning and challenging the monopoly of schools, effectively shouldering its proper share of the tasks of education.

1. As we begin to work towards creating a school environment conducive to fostering maximum competency in both Spanish and English for our children, we need to identify a pool of teachers proficient in a variety of standard and non-standard forms of the languages.

This, however, is merely half the job. These teachers must also possess the skill to communicate that knowledge in a way that speaks sensitively and effectively to the age group they will teach. Teaching aids and devices have yet to take the place of a competent teacher.

2. The mobilization of community support for these language goals can also serve to identify the range and form of language usage and resources outside the school. How the linguistic variety of the community can be considered in designing the school program should be constantly evaluated. Community groups, churches, cultural groups, peer groups, grandparents and the media are just a few of the potential resources for language education reinforcement.
3. We need to sensitively and persistently monitor the linguistic abilities and attitudes our children are acquiring. What motivating factors impede, neutralize or foster the learning of Spanish and English? To what extent does the child identify with the speakers of both languages and what are the economic and social advantages of competence in varieties of Spanish and English?

To go beyond such general guidelines in this document would be to anticipate the hard work of hammering out informed strategies that must occur in each concrete setting. As work proceeds towards a consciously articulated consensus regarding language goals for Puerto Ricans in the United States and as we become more skilled in assessing and utilizing local talents in behalf of this language policy, we can begin the task of clarifying educational approaches that more adequately reflect our values, hopes and dreams as a community. Clarifying our language policy is the beginning to this end.

Part II

Suggested Lines of Action

In stating a choice for competence in both Spanish and English, we are formulating language goals which have far reaching implications reflected in three immediate concerns:

1. As Puerto Ricans articulate a long range language policy, other Spanish speaking and minority language groups in the U.S. may be called upon to define their objectives as well. In both instances, the diverse sectors of the English speaking majority must eventually recognize and legitimize the language rights of minority peoples.
2. Developing strong support from the English and Spanish speaking communities will not be sufficient for the realization of a Puerto Rican language policy. Because existing conditions dictate the need for a more aggressive effort to change the current tentative and transitional character of official commitment to bilingualism, language planning by Puerto Ricans will require, in addition, a mobilization of support directed to the appropriate institutions and agencies. With the exception of those localities in which minor language gains have been registered, Puerto Ricans have

little, if any, political influence. The absence of even a measure of control over planning and implementation at the various governmental levels means that this area must remain one of continued striving and potential conflict with institutional representatives.

3. A third major concern is the need to deepen our knowledge of the problems inherent in shaping a policy of competent bilinguality. To make such a choice as informed as possible demands both long and short term research laden with methodological difficulties. The research and related priorities outlined in these pages constitute a very modest start on a long term effort.

To observe, then, that our plan must be flexible is to understate the fluidity necessary in the construction of a policy which on the one hand reflects our capabilities and on the other is informed by the realities of our diverse local concentrations. Several constants can be isolated, however, which direct us to furthering and deepening our grasp of the interconnections between objectives and policy. These constants function as constraints in that we have no control over them and can solely influence them in relation to the degree of unity mobilized at various community levels.

FEDERAL

1. While federal intervention in public education issues, particularly those dealing with the "disadvantaged," has achieved legitimacy in the last decade, this trend now appears to have reached a plateau with respect to the interests of minorities and the poor. States are reasserting their political prerogative to allocate funds and determine social service priorities, while joining the efforts of major cities to seek federal funds for large scale programs such as welfare, housing, and unemployment. Our need for information and analysis of this trend is particularly important at this juncture in national politics.
2. The rate of appropriations for bilingual instruction/education must be assessed with an eye to the areas of interest to the Federal government and the degree of investment in language issues. The agencies in which special projects are located, guidelines formulated, and projects monitored must likewise be identified.
3. The nature of federally sponsored research and the preference for university based individuals and policy centers needs investigation in order to develop strategies with local institutions engaged in spheres of concern to us.
4. Maximizing the utility of concerned individuals in the Federal establishment, e.g., workers, professionals, legislators, consultants, advisory committee members, etc. both in Washington and its

regional offices, has always been problematical. Identification of these individuals, their job responsibilities, contacts, and so on, would be necessary information for groups involved in language policy development.

5. Generating bills in the Congress via Chicano, Black, Puerto Rican and other sympathetic legislators would be of benefit in the campaign to highlight the language rights of minorities.

STATE

1. There has been some progress in mobilizing state legislatures (e.g. New Jersey, New York) on public education issues. Nevertheless while bilingual education legislation is passed, appropriations remain minimal or at a standstill. Monitoring these trends is essential since apparent victories may prove to be symbolic or very temporary (e.g., Colorado).
2. With increasing rapidity, the authority of state mechanisms is coming into play as urban centers decline in their capacity to maintain a stable financial base. Our traditional centers of concentration are shifting to other states outside of New York. In these new areas, different socio-political configurations may offer rich opportunities for small language programs.

LOCAL

1. Local and regional strengths have remained uncoordinated except in periods of crisis or mobilization for short run efforts. More and more contact between professionals, youth, unions and other representatives from local communities has characterized the last decade. This has opened up new needs and new dissatisfactions, but also new possibilities for integrated work.
2. One of our greatest deficiencies is in knowledge of locality by locality differences, aspirations, conditions, and combative experiences. With regard to a language objective, this assessment is critical and requires immediate attention not only in order to formulate a policy which accurately reflects our diversity, but also to make projections into the future, maximize our organizational strength, and reach higher levels of participation in the development of community wide goals.
3. Bilingual education issues have been a focal point of Puerto Rican mobilization nationwide. But in the attainment of programs and winning of legal suits, expectations as well as the level of disillusionment have been raised. The extent to which these movements have affected parent and teacher attitudes, institutional perceptions, etc., needs evaluation.

4. The perceptions of the younger generation, in and out of the schools, is a component of our work which gets little mention. How to tap the creative energies and engage the consciousness and responsiveness of youth remains a question to be addressed.
5. Bilingual programs outside of schools, (e.g. prisons, day care centers, and other avenues of expression - poetry, theatre, the media) are areas we have yet to explore in broader scope.

A PUERTO RICAN EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE RESEARCH INSTITUTE

These are but a few of the considerations which have to be taken into account and pursued in order to move towards an effective mustering of our potential strengths, present capacities, and untapped resources. Other concerns include developing strategies of local participation in data gathering, community assessment mechanisms, accountability and feedback linkages, training of staff, and so on.

Teacher and parent input and participation remain vital to the modification and refinement of Puerto Rican language objectives. Gaining the support of organizations and agencies across the country implies more than obtaining their perfunctory approval or acquiescence. Thus, the further elaboration and elucidation of a language policy that has broad community support requires that we define a process that will be open, accessible and engage broad sectors of the community.

At the same time, such a process may lose both its coherence and its momentum if it were to become excessively diffused in time or too complex in organization. Therefore, we propose that a central coordinating structure be staffed by people who are involved in community related issues, skilled in planning and organization, and most importantly, keenly aware of the political and socio-economic context of the Puerto Rican condition.

Towards this end, we propose to establish a Puerto Rican Education and Language Research Institute with the objective of furthering language planning and community development around language and education concerns. In order to harness the energies of parents, young people (in and out of school), teachers, paraprofessionals, politicians, and other significant persons, a program of local needs assessment, resource identification, and political mobilization has to be undertaken. This community organization phase will be supplemented with short and long range research to include language surveys, statistical record keeping, ethnographic studies and other investigations within designated target areas. Descriptions of Spanish and English language use among different sectors of the Puerto Rican community, economic and political configurations in areas of Puerto Rican concentration, and profiles of local and regional groups will be essential components of policy development.

The appended chart is a preliminary listing of action lines that will contribute to the development of a realistic language and education

policy for Puerto Ricans in the United States. The first year of this effort would be devoted to disseminating this report and creating the conditions under which a broad, critical response could be elicited and the building of a consensus on language goals could be initiated. In the second year, the objectives would be the development of a research agenda and investigative capacity as well as the organization and mobilization of support groups for the agreed upon language goals. Finally, in the third year, the mobilization of support would be concretized into local, regional and national plans while previous research initiatives begin to be evaluated.

An Action Agenda

YEAR #1

GOALS

To elicit a critical response and consensus building among Puerto Ricans in the U.S.

METHOD

Mass dissemination of Task Force documents

Preparation of Summary of Language Policy Paper. To publicize widely in U.S. and P.R. via news, radio and TV media.

STAGES OF IMPLEMENTATION

Establishment of a network for dissemination within the P.R. community in coordination with task force

- a. Gathering mailing list
- b. Contacting individuals and organizations at local, regional and national levels re plan for feed back.

Identification of local resources and involvement of communities in the process of dissemination.

Development of questionnaire or other feed-back instrument by which to evaluate task force report and obtain preliminary local information.

Communication and feedback from the general community and investigation of available support from public and private agencies.

YEAR # 1

GOALS

To obtain feedback
& consensus.

METHODS

Organization of local seminars
to discuss needs assessment,
history of bilingual efforts
locally & nationally, language
policy plan.

Selection of local task force
to follow up on larger group's
work.

STAGES OF IMPLEMENTATION

Selection of target areas.

Design of format for assessment
of local conditions, needs,
experience, resources, etc.

Gauging potential impact of
proposed language policy on
local community.

Evaluation of Year #1 and
submission of annual report to
National Task Force.

Organization of National Task
Force meeting to assess feedback
on language policy and first year's
work.

YEAR # 2

GOALS

To gather information and begin research.

To organize support groups for bilingual language policy.

To identify other major educational policy issues.

METHOD

Conducting language survey, ethnographic study, data base study.

Developing community-based "research practioners".

Developing a systematic network of contacts with broad array of organizations.

Publicizing relevant research findings (interim reports) among P.R. & general community.

Attending related conferences sponsored by groups of concern to us.

STAGES OF IMPLEMENTATION

Setting research priorities.

Selection and training of staff.

Coordination of all work with links to National Task Force.

Development of model instruments, as needed, for language survey, ethnographic study, data base, etc.

Holding of regional and national strategy sessions with task forces - local and national plus added members.

Developing liaison with other Spanish - speaking groups.

Organization of sessions with professional organizations, politicians, parents' organizations, etc.

Developing position papers on language issues.

Evaluation and annual report as in Year #1.

Explore funding sources for follow-up actions on language policy and for research into other educational issues.

YEAR / 3

GOALS

To continue mobilization of support.

To evaluate research and information base.

To disseminate research findings.

To begin analyses & plan research strategies around major educational policy issues identified.

METHOD

Based on years 1-2

STAGES OF IMPLEMENTATION

Pursuing funding support for local & national projects.

Tabulating research results & interpreting findings.

Publishing & disseminating final research report.

Evaluation & annual report as in Years 1 & 2.

Part III

Toward an Adequate Data Base on the Puerto Rican School Situation in the United States

Throughout the Task Force discussions many key policy questions could not find satisfactory answers due to the absence or defective nature of statistical information regarding Puerto Ricans in or out of the United States school system. Such queries as how primarily English-speaking children perform in school compared with those primarily Spanish-speaking; to what extent the potential Puerto Rican enrollment is included in school planning; how many Puerto Rican children study in one or another type of learning situation, and whether they are clustered in sufficient numbers to facilitate developing a bilingual/bicultural program without dislocation problems can be given only impressionistic replies.

Certain less factual items just as crucial to our considerations remained on a largely speculative level, for lack of research or difficulties of interpretation. For example, the degree of cultural isolation experienced by Puerto Rican children; their alienation from the mainstream Anglo social system; their world-view, aspirations and self images. These and many other questions cannot be easily answered without an adequate data base to furnish elemental information.

For years many in our community have deplored the inadequacy of statistical sources and the misuse of survey results concerning Puerto

Ricans. It now seems more productive to sketch out the components of a minimal statistical system, essential to future research on Puerto Rican educational policy issues. The following ideas were organized with reference to the principal sources of public information, namely; 1) the U.S. Census, 2) the Current Population Survey, 3) Vital Register Statistics, 4) local school records, 5) data collected by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and 6) research conducted under government or foundation sponsorship. Together, these elements constitute a starting point for an adequate data base.

1. An accurate and universal count of Puerto Ricans in the national census taken every ten years is the most fundamental requirement, because it provides a basis for most surveys and provides information on the social and economic characteristics of Puerto Rican communities, school enrollment and attainment, employment, occupation and income received, housing, family composition and migration background. The census also provides evidence for complaints and litigation based on representation.

The 1980 Census must improve on the 1970 Census, which failed to count many Puerto Ricans and provided only limited published information for Puerto Ricans in many states. The negative consequences for Puerto Rican communities prompted many toward a reform movement, mobilized in conjunction with other Spanish origin groups. It began with complaints and litigation, included such studies as the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights report, Counting the Forgotten, and eventually led to the enactment

of Public Law 94-311 on June 16, 1976 (Appendix II). The law calls for the U.S. Census Bureau and the Departments of Agriculture, Labor, Health, Education and Welfare to improve the coverage and quality of statistics on the Spanish origin population, and for the Office of Management and Budget to develop a government-wide program in this regard.

The law also used the Spanish origin and descent categories developed by the Census Bureau as an alternative to identification methods that had proved inadequate or only partially effective. This allows each respondent to self-identify as Puerto Rican, or Mexican, Cuban, Central/South American or other Spanish. Because self-identification provides a direct, clear and meaningful way of determining who belongs to an ethnic group, its practicality outweighs certain problems found in using this method. For Puerto Ricans, it has the advantage of identifying people whose grandparents were born in Puerto Rico, the "third" generation not covered in the traditional definition. In the 1950, 1960 and 1970 censuses, most data for Puerto Ricans were for those born in Puerto Rico or in the United States, of parents born in Puerto Rico.

For an adequate data base in the future, it is essential that every questionnaire of the 1980 Census contain a self identification question on each person's origin, or descent, including Puerto Rican. In this way the social, economic and housing information so crucial to programs

at the neighborhood level will become available. For comparing the results with past statistics, the place of birth and parentage question should be included as a sample question. But as of September 1977 the birth and parentage item had been deleted by the Census Bureau from the list of sample questions submitted to the U.S. Congress for final approval.

Here and in following sections the proper identification of Puerto Ricans is heavily stressed, since this is perhaps our greatest data base problem at the present time. In certain regions people may question this emphasis, because in their opinion unity with other Spanish origin groups is an important goal for community action. Our recommendations do not deny the value of unity. Much to the contrary, adequate identification of Puerto Ricans is part of a larger effort to count the national Latino population. Group divisions contribute to assure accuracy, and measure the unique characteristics and special problems of each major Spanish origin group.

We are also aware that certain data items crucially important to Puerto Ricans should be included in the census questionnaire; at minimum, a question on use of the Spanish language. Furthermore, the social and economic information available for Puerto Ricans should be published in as much detail as possible and in small area units such as census tracts and school districts, even in cities where relatively few Puerto Ricans live. This will help define the needs of the barrios in many places where otherwise no community data would be available.

A National Advisory Committee on the Spanish Origin Population for the 1980 Census was established by the Census Bureau in 1975, including six Puerto Ricans: Raquel Creitoff, Luz E. Cuadrado (Chairperson), José Hernández, Jorge Piñeiro, Lorenzo Piñeiro and América Sorrentini de Blaut. They collaborate with a Puerto Rican Committee for the 1980 Census organized in New York and coordinated by José Oscar Alers and Antonio Stevens-Arroyo. Both Committees have gathered suggestions for improving the 1980 Census and made recommendations to the Census Bureau.

2. For many practical purposes, including educational projects for which community needs must be specified in numbers, the Census requires updating from time to time. On a national level this is the main purpose of the Current Population Survey, which resembles the Census, but is periodically conducted on a sample basis, providing contemporary measures. For the past three years the CPS has had a Puerto Rican self identification question as a standard item and has produced some information on our population, including data on school attainment. Certainly the CPS could be improved but in any case it would not provide updated information for individual communities, since the national sample is too limited to allow even for state or metropolitan area tabulations, except in certain very limited instances. (U.S. Census Bureau..."The Current Population Survey: An Overview," 1975).

Puerto Ricans are not alone in wanting updates of census data. Virtually every group affected by such public concerns as revenue sharing

feel the need for specific, currently accurate information. Updates are completed by cities and counties, sometimes by contract with the Census Bureau, but almost always according to the determination of the local government or planning bureau. This means that if the design for an update does not include an estimate of the Puerto Rican population, no data will be produced of value for determining our community needs. The issue usually reduces to whether Puerto Rican community action groups are aware of plans for an update and how effective their proposal efforts and political pressure are for inclusion.

Experience shows that in most cases Puerto Ricans are left out of the plans for local updates, resulting in no current information for estimating needs for bilingual/bicultural programs and similar purposes. Faced with exclusion from public resources or limited participation, due to a deficient local data base, Puerto Rican communities may eventually resort to counting their own population. An example is Milwaukee, Wisconsin, where a special census was conducted in 1975, at local government expense. Although the Hispanic community had shown its concern for an update of the Latino population totals, a Spanish origin indicator was not included in the special census. As a result, the Puerto Rican Organization, a community agency, undertook to estimate the population by sampling a predominantly Puerto Rican area of the city.

A community self count begins by determining geographic boundaries (for example, census tracts) for the places where most Puerto Ricans live. According to a sampling plan prepared by someone with the required

skills, a list of households to be canvassed is then made up. This is generally necessary because using the city directory to identify Spanish surnamed households will likely miss Puerto Ricans subletting a unit registered in another name, those sharing a unit with another family, and those not having a Spanish surname, nationally estimated at 37 per cent of the Puerto Rican population (Census Bureau Technical Paper 38, 1975.) Community organization and program client lists tend to be incomplete and inaccurate, since many Puerto Ricans may not be enrolled or may have recently moved in or out. To be correct, a community self count must canvass every sample household, regardless of whether it appears to be Puerto Rican or not, and do this in a brief time (a few days or at most a week) and at some monthly period when people do not generally move in or out.

The questionnaire should be a small card, easily counted or coded for computer tabulation, containing an identifier distinguishing Puerto Rican households from the non-Puerto Rican - which can be further specified as black, white, Mexican American, etc., but not more than a few categories. The total number of persons in each sample household should be determined according to instructions provided in the United States or United Nations census taking manuals. If data about individuals is recorded, the most essential items are their age, sex, duration of residence at present address, place of birth, and whether they personally are of Puerto Rican origin or descent. Questions on social and economic topics should be kept for later, when completion of the self count

enables a community to return to a subsample of certain households to collect this information. Whether volunteer or paid workers are engaged, a training session covering a uniform method of approach and data collection is a must, as well as a careful check by a supervisor, of each card completed. The Puerto Rican and non Puerto Rican populations projected from the sample should be compared with census results and other estimates, and some attempt made to estimate the number of Puerto Ricans living outside the community self count area. Any population estimate has a certain plus or minus factor arising from inevitable errors, and this should be included in presenting the figures.

In Appendix II a guide is provided for local community groups that wish to obtain a revised estimate of their population without an actual door-to-door count. The method presented, however, is not a perfect substitute for an actual survey and should be used with caution, usually with the advice of a statistician or a person knowledgeable about population projections.

3. A very important element of an adequate statistical system is inclusion of a Puerto Rican identifier in the birth, death and marriage statistics compiled by the Vital Register offices of the State Department of Health. Birth and death data provide information of use in calculating the undercount factor in the Census. Many social purposes are served, such as enabling school districts to project future enrollment levels and the planning of health care delivery systems to accord with the illnesses prevalent in a community. Marriage statistics are of value in estimating household formation rates and for determining divorce trends.

Except in New York City, where fragments of data are available for persons born in Puerto Rico, no vital statistics are known to exist for Puerto Ricans in the United States. Until very recently, the U.S. Standard Certificates included items on sex, age and race (white, negro, American Indian, etc., specify _____); on citizenship; state or nation of birth; occupation; kind of business or industry (of parents or deceased); residential location and whether within or outside city limits, in addition to the social security number and information specific to the birth or death. Except as Puerto Rico was indicated as a place of birth (as in the New York City records), there was no way of identifying a Puerto Rican in these items. Even if the surnames were coded as "Spanish" according to the Census Bureau's master list, the identification was not equivalent to Puerto Rican and remained incomplete, because, as previously mentioned, only 63 per cent of Puerto Ricans in the United States have one of the Spanish surnames in this classification system.

In the 1975-76 revision of the U.S. Standard Certificate, a recommendation was finally made by the National Center for Health Statistics calling for inclusion of a Spanish origin identifier, as in the Census. But vital register is primarily a matter of State, rather than Federal jurisdiction, so that acceptance of this recommendation was optional. As of September 1977 not all states had accepted. Puerto Rican organizations concerned with local data base problems would do well to contact the State Registrar's Office and request that attention

be given to an appropriate identifier for Puerto Ricans. If a few states were to go beyond acceptance of the Puerto Rican identifier and begin to publish the information, chances for national data on vital statistics for Puerto Ricans would be significantly increased. In addition, local communities would have an annual tally of Puerto Rican births and deaths, of use in updating population figures. Appendix IV contains a selected list of the State Vital Registrars.

4. Data collected in school records resemble birth and death certificates in that a minimum set of personal facts are obtained, in addition to information needed for administrative purposes; that is, the transfer, enrollment and achievement of students. Except in New York City and possibly Chicago, these records do not appear to separately designate Puerto Ricans. Aside from the need for a Puerto Rican identifier, several important goals can be recommended for improving the data base from school records:

- Annual figures for Puerto Rican students continuing enrollment and transferred in or out of the city provide valuable measures of population change for updating local figures for Puerto Ricans of all ages (see Appendix III);
- Noncontinuance or drop out is perhaps the most important item to be tabulated from the school records, although the following should also be produced:

-A comparison of the students' age with their enrollment grade, in order to determine how many are delayed - because they were left back or placed in a lower grade, and to what extent the delay problem occurs in a given school or district. Generally speaking, a student can be considered as delayed if 7 or more results from subtracting the enrollment grade from his or her age. Examples: A child age 9 enrolled in the third grade ($9 - 3 = 6$) is on time, but a 9 year old in first grade ($9 - 1 = 8$) is delayed.

-Comparisons of achievement scores for Puerto Rican children with those obtained by all students, the majority or non Puerto Rican children, can be very informative in detecting problems in individual schools or districts, where a pattern of down-grading or lack of incentives may exist.

-School records often show some diagnosis of learning problems, based on the instructor's evaluation. These can also be very indicative of recurrent difficulties experienced by Puerto Rican children, and ways in which their behavior characteristics are interpreted by teachers.

Research recently completed by ASPIRA of America, Inc., showed that nationally about 60 per cent of Puerto Rican students do not graduate from High School, most of them leaving school after attaining

the age limit for compulsory attendance. Among factors contributing to the high drop out rate, the delay problem mentioned plays an important role; almost half of all Puerto Rican students were at least one year behind the usual schedule for elementary and secondary school completion. Also operative in causing drop outs were poverty and unemployment in certain communities, although an even stronger influence came from relatively low levels of school investment per student and the minimal recognition and participation given to the Puerto Rican community. Local situations varied considerably among the twelve metropolitan categories included in the study - from the New England cities, which showed a particularly weak condition, to California, especially San Francisco, which scored much higher than average.

Several purposes combined to necessitate a follow up study. The initial profile was based on 1970 Census information, by now out of date as a measure of conditions in the school system. The study raised numerous questions that could not be answered from the Census itself, such as whether the amount of money spent per student accurately measured conditions at schools attended by Puerto Ricans and to what extent Puerto Ricans face segregation, isolation and lower quality education, as do other segments of the United States population. But most importantly, a need was felt for some form of annual accounts that would enable the Puerto Rican community to assess the progress, stability or decline in the quality of schooling in those areas where many Puerto Ricans live. The questionnaire devised for this purpose is presented in Appendix V.

5. Data collected nationally for purposes of compliance with guidelines issued by the Office of Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, distinguish "Spanish American," and more recently "Hispanic" persons among students and staff. While undoubtedly many Puerto Ricans are included in these categories, they are not the equivalent of "Puerto Rican" in most areas, since other Spanish American or Hispanic groups are also included, leaving no easy and statistically valid way of determining the precise composition. Moreover, no uniform method seems to prevail in the data collection, since beyond a few general instructions, each school district and principal is asked to devise a way of identifying students. According to our inquiries, no validity studies of a detailed nature have been completed to check on the accuracy of the methods locally adopted.

For example, the Montgomery County, Maryland Public Schools, recently sent a Pupil Race Verification form to all homes in the school community. This complied with data collection requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the 1975 changes in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare definition of race and ethnic categories:

Hispanic: A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race.

White: Not of Hispanic origin. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, the Middle East, or the Indian Subcontinent.

Black: Not of Hispanic origin. A person having origins in any of the black racial groups.

Asian or Pacific Islander: A person having origin in any of the original peoples of the Far East, South East Asia or the Pacific Islands. This area includes for example, China, Japan, Korea, Philippines and Samoa.

(Note: National guidelines separately designate Native American peoples.)

Beginning in 1973 the OCR-DHEW data collection forms included the requirement that an estimate be made of the gross number of children speaking predominately a language other than English at home or school. In 1975 this was incorporated in the Lau Compliance Form which further required that non-English speaking children be identified according to the language spoken, including Spanish. Although a second Lau Compliance Form was projected for 1977, the data collection was not repeated in 1976, and does not seem to be an immediate likelihood. In any case, the language forms do not specify "Puerto Rican," and therefore provide no way of knowing how many of the Spanish speaking children are Puerto Rican.

A similar limitation affects the National Survey of Languages, a research project conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics in compliance with Section 731(c) of the amended Bilingual Education legislation, Title VII of the Education Act of 1974. In July 1975

questions on language and education were added to the Current Population Survey earlier described - including whether Spanish is the "usual" or "second" language currently spoken in a household, the school enrollment status of children and their difficulties with English. Two additional surveys are planned, with expanded coverage and more detail. But unless policies change at NCES, none of the information produced will be available by a Puerto Rican designation. (For further documentation, see Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 60, July 1976, and "Results of the Survey of Languages," paper for Fifth Annual International Bilingual Bicultural Education Conference, May 1976 by Dorothy Waggoner, NCES).

The National Survey of Languages illustrates the political intricacies of the identification problem. In the July 1975 CPS the Puerto Rican self identification question was actually used and the results could have been provided separately for Puerto Ricans. NCES is bound, however, by the racial and ethnic nomenclatures adopted by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Hispanic, Black, etc., as in Montgomery County example), a policy differing from and strongly defended against the origin-or-descent categories developed by the Census Bureau. DHEW officials have justified their policy on the basis of simplicity and equality, claiming that if Puerto Ricans were separately identified, then Native Americans would have to be identified by tribe, and Asian Americans by nationality. Accordingly, the only refinement admissible to DHEW is to subdistinguish Hispanics by race; that is, whether they

are black, Native or Asian American or white. Aside from being statistically inconsistent, the results tend to be socially meaningless whenever racial distinctions are attempted among Hispanics, most of whom represent a genetic mixture of races and by tradition are not accustomed to make the racial distinctions other Americans frequently take for granted. Briefly stated, until DHEW and similar agencies begin complying with Public Law 94-311 and become responsive to the Puerto Rican community in their data collection and publication systems, the prevailing anomalous situation will likely continue and produce, at best, low quality information.

6. A surprising amount of research is conducted on the educational situation of Puerto Ricans in the United States - often by non-Puerto Rican scholars and almost always generating at least some factual information. For example, a cursory review of social science abstracts from 1960 to 1969 revealed a dozen Ph.D. dissertations on topics involving Puerto Ricans, most of them related in one or other way to learning, school participation and social "integration." The point here is that very little of this effort is directly related to the development of a national data base, for a variety of reasons. Most research does not utilize such public data sources as the Census, nor even the school records; the objective is usually to prove or disprove a hypothesis based on theoretical considerations, and generally speaking, no coordination exists among the research projects, except as influenced by a disciplinary perspective.

A search of research projects indexed by the Smithsonian Science Information Exchange under the subject heading of "Puerto Ricans in the Continental United States" revealed over fifty research projects supported by foundations and government agencies, in particular the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Research subjects involving topics ranging from education, employment, sociology, personnel technology, and civil rights, to bibliographies and health matters.

In 1964, the Federal Interagency Committee on Education was created to assist the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Education DHEW, in the identification of national educational needs and goals. In carrying out its mandate under Executive Order 11761, this Committee addressed their concerns for the improvement of educational opportunities for minorities with the establishment of a Task Force on Higher Education for Disadvantaged Minorities, which has initiated studies focusing on higher education for Puerto Ricans.

The Commerce Business Daily provides in synopsis government procurement actions from diverse agencies which outline the conduct of contract research on minority issues, among these contracts on issues of concern to Puerto Ricans which have a direct or indirect bearing on education. For example, a recent request for proposals was for a study of minorities and drug abuse problems and effective treatment for minorities. While apparently marginal to educational issues, the scope of work called for a descriptive and comparative study in three communities (one of them Puerto Rican) in which data

on demography, drug usage and history, treatment modality, criminal justice history, etiology, community adjustment, employment and/or schooling, etc. would be collected.

An example in more advanced development stages is the National Institute of Child and Human Development's contract No. 72-2795 with the Research Institute for the Study of Man, located in New York City. This project concerned the education, marriage, childbearing and employment patterns of Puerto Rican and other Hispanic women. Among other results, a report presented by A.J. Jaffe and Ruth M. Cullen at the Population Association of America 1975 annual meetings concluded that "Spanish Americans appear to be following in the footsteps of the older immigrant groups who preceded them...and already seem to be disappearing as a distinctive cultural group" (pages 31-32). Moreover, Puerto Ricans - in lowest place regarding schooling and social and economic status - are admonished to follow the lead taken by Cubans and South Americans, who combine advanced education, high rates of professional and white collar work, small families and marriage with non-Hispanics in a success formula for upward mobility. But the outlook seems hardly promising, because the investigators predict that "significant educational differentials will continue among the several (Hispanic) groups for at least several decades into the future. The groups more schooled in 1970 will continue more schooled in 2000" (page 2).

Timely observations regarding such projects can be summarized from the statement of the original Task Force of Puerto Rican Educators consulted by the National Institute of Education (The Rican, Journal of Contemporary Puerto Rican Thought, Vol. II, No. 1, 1974). The "problems" selected for research are assumed to arise from individuals, not from their social environment, and standards defining their behavior derive from the majority culture. Research is often viewed as an end in itself, with excessive importance given to advanced methods, the crisis reactive models in vogue, the professional visibility of the principal investigator, and cumulative academic work either nonexistent for Puerto Ricans, or amassed primarily by scholars not sharing a Puerto Rican perspective. Little or no effort or even chance is provided for effective Puerto Rican participation, because traditional merit considerations favor the non-Puerto Rican as principal investigator, who in turn plays a decisive role in the hiring and engagement of project staff and advisors. Puerto Rican consultancy in proposal review and project development is typically disregarded or outvoted by others, treated in a perfunctory manner, provided by a surrogate Puerto Rican of other Hispanic background or simply absent. Puerto Ricans working in a project rarely benefit professionally by learning the skills or acquiring the status needed for decision making and interpretation of results. Finally, the Puerto Rican community's knowledge and experience are not tapped, nor are feedback channels established for communicating research findings to the community in a generally understandable way. In sum, inappropriate expectations regarding

substance, format and timing; the restricted social circle governing proposal preparation and consideration, and minimal budget allocations have all combined to effectively shut the door to a genuinely Puerto Rican contribution to research.

It can be therefore concluded that one of the priority goals for a National Puerto Rican Task Force on Educational Policy is the discussion and establishment of an agenda of research topics, their relative value and contributions to an emerging body of knowledge relevant to the main educational concerns of Puerto Ricans. Equally important is the gathering together of all available information in a clearinghouse that would have the capability of condensing the data and making it public in an understandable, uniform manner.

The Task Force also encourages the development of uniform criteria for assuring that a national data base would combine quality standards with responsiveness to Puerto Rican interests. Provisions for meshing the gears of the Census, local population updates and the Current Population Survey, the Vital Register Statistics, school records and independent research - all of this will be instrumental to obtaining a contemporary and accurate picture of our educational situation, an advantage already available to most Americans.

Our work is thus essentially beginning. In some respects it aims at major policy turn-arounds, plainly necessary if Puerto Ricans are to be granted effective participation in research fields relating to education. It seeks administrative reform, clearly a matter for statistical decision

makers in the Office of Management and Budget and other custodians of the public data production and dissemination mechanisms. But in this basically political struggle we should not lose sight of the transcending need to evolve a data base strategy with substance - ideas, methods and interpretations that express the Puerto Rican vision.

Appendices

Appendix A

The National Puerto Rican Task Force on Educational Policy:

A Brief History and List of Participants.

The National Puerto Rican Task Force on Educational Policy was formally organized in June 1975 with the support of a \$25,000 grant from the Ford Foundation. Puerto Rican educators, social scientists, lawyers and community leaders from various parts of the country who had been actively involved in educational issues within their local communities sought the resources of the Foundation to allow its members to begin a systematic review and analysis of educational policy needs of Puerto Ricans in the United States.

Although the Ford Foundation support made possible the convening of the Task Force on several occasions and the preparation of this Report, it was neither the availability of this support nor the Foundation's interest in this area that first brought the members of the Task Force together and shaped their agenda. That process had its roots in a series of experiences that the members shared long before they convened as a Task Force. A brief review of that experience is instructive, not only because it sheds light on conditions leading to the creation of the Task Force, but also for what it reveals about the problems that minority groups face when they seek to play a meaningful role in shaping research and policy affecting their own communities.

Over the years, various members of the present Task Force had been repeatedly called to Washington, singly or in groups, by a number of federal agencies and asked to give their views on Puerto Rican educational needs. But eventually many of us were increasingly reluctant to respond to these requests, having become more and more skeptical about the reasons our advice was solicited and the unwritten agenda of the solicitors. It always turned out that community views on Puerto Rican needs were sought only within the limits defined by these agencies. Furthermore, our general experience was that even when very specific recommendations were made and welcomed, there was minimal commitment and follow-up. The inescapable conclusion reached in most cases was that Puerto Rican participation was arranged primarily for cosmetic reasons, with no genuine intention to listen to such advice and take it into account in program or policy development.

As Puerto Ricans discussed these experiences with each other, reluctance to respond to agency requests turned into a strong desire to confront the issue and to somehow communicate both our criticisms and expectations. This movement came to a head at a session convened by the National Institute of Education in Washington on May 4, 1974. The group used the occasion to draft and present to NIE a statement criticizing the way research agendas are developed, carried out and supported by agencies like NIE. We also asked NIE to share this statement with the other minority groups they were convening and to reconvene our group in the near future to discuss NIE's response. Not unexpectedly, the response was negative.*

*This statement was published in The Rican

This experience led to increased contacts among the group present and to the determination to find a framework and necessary resources to allow us to meet on a regular basis in order to define a research and policy agenda based on the Puerto Rican community's own sense of direction, needs and priorities rather than the shifting objectives of continuously reorganized federal programs. The National Puerto Rican Task Force on Educational Policy thus began its work with the following objectives:

1. to undertake a detailed review of educational research needs and priorities as they emerge from the experience of our communities around the country rather than from the mandates of federal programs aimed broadly at minorities.
2. to allow for policy analysis on these issues that is national in scope and takes into account the interaction of educational processes and institutions in Puerto Rico and the United States, including a critical review of bilingual and equal opportunity legislation, programs and practices.
3. to evaluate the need for a clearing house for information on education in the Puerto Rican community concerning current programs as well as assessments of developing needs projected by the community.

4. to study needs for technical support and program follow-up among Puerto Rican educators and others engaged in informational and policy exchanges with government and other agencies.

Although the question of research needs and priorities occupied a central place in our deliberations, the process of articulating and linking them to the social realities of Puerto Rican communities made it increasingly clear that policy analysis had to come first, and that research needs would require assessment in terms of basic issues that compelled our attention as members of a national minority. The key question was: what kind of education, and education for what? In particular, several important developments in bilingual education demanded our attention, including a variety of initiatives taken on legal and other fronts by communities as well as state and federal governments, likely to shape future directions in the education of Puerto Ricans.

Clearly, in some sense, "policy" and "policies" were being made. But what exactly were those policies? Were they clear and consistent? In whose interest did they work? Supposing all these localized actions constitute a national "policy", how are they to be coherently articulated? If they do not make up policy, what implications do they contain for future actions and developments? Our discussion and analysis of these questions drew further attention to problems posed by the widespread and accelerating activities involving bilingual education. The following

illustrate points of concern:

Legal actions generated by the educational problems or Puerto Rican students were yielding very limited definitions of bilingual education.

Many Puerto Rican communities were not financially and technically prepared to monitor and evaluate the sprouting bilingual programs.

The data base regarding the scope and nature of the educational situation of Puerto Rican children was inadequate for purposes of need assessment and program evaluation.

Although bilingual education was the primary educational movement in ferment in Puerto Rican communities, non-Puerto Ricans seemed to be defining it for us, and determining how it would develop.

Our own goals in bilingual programs reflected uncertainty: Was this primarily for the advantage of children or was it about the only political "wedge" available to pry open doors to social participation? Should we make our children (a relatively powerless group, themselves) the focus of policy while still unsure about the benefits of proposed educational programs?

Coming to grips with this array of questions, problems and issues was no easy matter. On the one hand, there was clearly a need to make sense out the immediate situation and contribute to the Puerto Rican community's ability to deal with that immediacy. At the same time, that situation itself made plain the need for longer term and broader range analysis, research and planning.

In terms of immediate needs, we moved on two fronts. First, to help communities better understand the litigation process involving bilingual education and to enhance their ability to participate more effectively in this arena, we prepared a manual on bilingual education and the law for use by community organizations. This manual is Volume II of the Task Force's Report. Secondly, we undertook a review of the existing data base on the educational situation of Puerto Rican children and made recommendations on how this base can be developed so as to give Puerto Ricans on a continuous basis the kind of information necessary for sound analysis and policy making. This review and the recommendations involved are contained in part of this Report.

Regarding the fundamental educational issues confronting Puerto Ricans, we felt it was imperative to address ourselves in the first instance to the need for a clear and coherent language policy. What is bilingualism? What is education for bilinguality? What are the political, and social implications of opting for any particular combination of English and Spanish as languages of instruction at different levels

of education? Since language has been increasingly projected from within and outside our community as a means to solve the educational problems of Puerto Ricans it seemed appropriate and necessary to examine the equation and determine some of the necessary conditions for wise decisions in this connection.

Although the main body of this report highlights the need for a clear and coherent language policy, it should not be considered in any way a definitive policy statement. On the contrary, we offer this document as a tool and resource for a much needed debate throughout the country's Puerto Rican communities. A specific proposal outlining some of the organizational structures and processes that will be required to realize this dialogue is also included in this report.

National Puerto Rican Task Force on Educational Policy

Frank Bonilla Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños City University of New York	New York, New York
Maria Josefa Canino Associate Professor, Livingston College Rutgers University	New Brunswick, New Jersey
Luz Cuadrado Boricuas Unidos en Acción	Boston, Massachusetts
Ricardo Fernandez School of Education University of Wisconsin	Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Ruben Franco Community Fellow 1977-1978 Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Boston, Massachusetts
José Hernandez Department of Sociology University of Wisconsin	Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Sylvia Herrera Escuela Cooperativa de Hostos	Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico
Hernan LaFontaine Office of Bilingual Education Board of Education of the City of New York	Brooklyn, New York
Josephine Nieves Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños City University of New York	New York, New York
Jorge Piñeiro Western Region Puerto Rican Council	San José, California
Angel Quintero Alfaro Universidad de Puerto Rico	Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico
Camille Rodriguez Garcia Coordinator National Puerto Rican Task Force on Educational Policy	New York, New York
Manuel del Valle Adjunct Assistant Professor Fordham University	New York, New York

The Task Force thanks the following people for their important contribution and support in the development of this document. They include Antonio Baez of the Midwest General Assistance Center, University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee; Emilio Gonzalez Atilas and Pedro Pedraza of the Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños, City University of New York.

Special thanks must also be extended to Zunilda Lopez of the Centro for her assistance in preparing this document.

APPENDIX B



Public Law 94-311
94th Congress, H. J. Res. 92
June 16, 1976

Joint Resolution

Relating to the publication of economic and social statistics for Americans of Spanish origin or descent.

Whereas more than twelve million Americans identify themselves as being of Spanish-speaking background and trace their origin or descent from Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Central and South America, and other Spanish-speaking countries; and

Whereas these Americans of Spanish origin or descent have made significant contributions to enrich American society and have served their Nation well in time of war and peace; and

Whereas a large number of Americans of Spanish origin or descent suffer from racial, social, economic, and political discrimination and are denied the basic opportunities they deserve as American citizens and which would enable them to begin to lift themselves out of the poverty they now endure; and

Whereas improved evaluation of the economic and social status of Americans of Spanish origin or descent will assist State and Federal Governments and private organizations in the accurate determination of the urgent and special needs of Americans of Spanish origin or descent; and

Whereas the provision and commitment of State, Federal, and private resources can only occur when there is an accurate and precise assessment of need: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Department of Labor, in cooperation with the Department of Commerce, shall develop methods for improving and expanding the collection, analysis, and publication of unemployment data relating to Americans of Spanish origin or descent.

SEC. 2. The Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Agriculture shall each collect, and publish regularly, statistics which indicate the social, health, and economic condition of Americans of Spanish origin or descent.

SEC. 3. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce and with the heads of other data-gathering Federal agencies, shall develop a Government-wide program for the collection, analysis, and publication of data with respect to Americans of Spanish origin or descent.

SEC. 4. The Department of Commerce, in cooperation with appropriate Federal, State and local agencies and various population study groups and experts, shall immediately undertake a study to determine what steps would be necessary for developing creditable estimates of undercounts of Americans of Spanish origin or descent in future censuses.

Spanish-Americans.
Economic and social statistics publication.
29 USC 8.
15 USC 1516a.

15 USC 1516a note.

13 USC 141 note

13 USC 141.
note.

Affirmative
action pro-
gram.
Report to
Congress.
13 USC 22
note.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Commerce shall ensure that, in the Bureau of the Census data-collection activities, the needs and concerns of the Spanish-origin population are given full recognition through the use of Spanish language questionnaires, bilingual enumerators, and other such methods as deemed appropriate by the Secretary.

SEC. 6. The Department of Commerce shall implement an affirmative action program within the Bureau of the Census for the employment of personnel of Spanish origin or descent and shall submit a report to Congress within one year of the enactment of this Act on the progress of such program.

Approved June 16, 1976.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORT No. 94-190 (Comm. on Post Office and Civil Service).
SENATE REPORT No. 94-896 (Comm. on Post Office and Civil Service).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Vol. 121 (1975): Oct. 29, considered and passed House.
Vol. 122 (1976): May 21, considered and passed Senate,
amended.

June 7, House concurred in Senate amendments.

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS:

Vol. 12, No. 25 (1976): June 16, Presidential statement.

Appendix C

SUGGESTIONS FOR UPDATING 1970 CENSUS FIGURES FOR LOCAL PUERTO RICAN POPULATIONS

1. Begin by multiplying the 1970 Census totals by 1.077 to allow for the minimum undercount factor - established in the black case by the Census Bureau, and for Puerto Ricans by reconstructing the entire Puerto Rican population; see or quote José Hernández, "Puerto Rican Migration as a Demographic Factor: Solution and Problem," *Interamerican Review*, 4, 4 (Winter, 1974-75): 531. Example: if the local population in 1970 is 10,000 the adjusted figure would be 10,770.
2. The undercount factor varies from community to community and may in some cases be higher than the 7.7 percent figure cited. However, nationally a higher estimate begins to pose problems in reconciling continental figures with those for the island and with reasonable estimates of vital rates for continental Puerto Ricans. If there is some indication locally that the undercount was greater than 7.7 percent, it should be carefully documented. Example: in the model community of 10,000 Puerto Ricans, there is evidence for a 12.5 percent undercount. The adjusted figure would then be $10,000 \times 1.125$ or 11,250.
3. The available data for continental Puerto Ricans indicates an annual growth factor of approximately 2.3 percent. This is a net figure, considering +2.9 percent for births and -0.6 for deaths and is a very reasonable estimate for a young population having a moderately high fertility background. The 2.3 percent must be applied to the adjusted base population as though it were a compound interest rate in a savings account. Example:

10,770 in 1970 x 1.023 becomes	11,018 in 1971
11,018 in 1971 x 1.023	= 11,271 in 1972
11,271 in 1972 x 1.023	= 11,531 in 1973
11,531 in 1973 x 1.023	= 11,796 in 1974
11,796 in 1974 x 1.023	= 12,067 in 1975
12,067 in 1975 x 1.023	= 12,345 in 1976

Since the Census was taken in April, the last figure can be assumed to be a minimum estimate of the population as of April 1976. It has grown from the 10,000 recorded in 1970 to at least 12,345 now. But:

4. The remaining factor of migration must be considered and is the most difficult to estimate. Some communities, such as in Connecticut and New Jersey, have recently grown rapidly due to the influx of Puerto Ricans from New York City, Puerto Rico and other areas. In so far

as a positive net migration figure can be substantiated, it should be added to the annual growth factor, as just illustrated. Example: Suppose an annual increase of +2.0 percent can be documented. Then instead of 1.023 the compound interest rate would be 1.043, producing a figure of 13,865 in 1976 for our model local population, a small but important difference!

5. Migration figures are hard to document. Some technicians rely on school enrollment records, assuming that the rate of increase among the students in elementary school reflects the net transfer of people into a community. Most school districts do not separately identify Puerto Rican children in their records, and so this is usually a method we cannot use. For lack of better statistics, the 1970 Census question on place of residence can be used as a basis for a migration estimate.

Example: Suppose that out of the 10,000 Puerto Ricans enumerated in the 1970 census, 1,500 were not living here in 1975. This means a five-year increase of 15 percent, or an annual average of +3 percent. So, the compound interest rate for projecting 10,770 persons would be 1.053 or 1.023 for natural growth plus 1.030 for migration. At this level, the 1976 population would be 14,652.

6. In calculating the "percent Puerto Rican" for affirmative action and similar purposes, one also needs to know the total city or county population. The 1970 Census figure might be used, but most cities have a global updated figure and that is to be preferred. In many cities where Puerto Rican communities are located the total population is actually declining, which in itself means a higher percentage of Puerto Ricans. Also, by using the updated total population figure, one avoids the possible accusation that a Puerto Rican updated figure is compared with an old total population.

Example: The 1970 Census for city X showed 147,000 total population and 10,000 or 6.8 percent Puerto Ricans (7.3 when adjusted for undercount). The City Planning Department now says there are 128,000 persons living there, of which 14,652 are Puerto Ricans. This signifies 11.4 percent Puerto Rican. (But if we had used the 1970 total population, it would be 9.9 percent Puerto Rican.)

Appendix D

SELECTED LIST FROM THE 1975
DIRECTORY OF STATE REGISTRARS

Mr. Merle L. Shields
Chief, Vital Statistics Section
Department of Health
410 N Street
Sacramento, California 95814
916/445-2684

Mr. Harold Burdo
Acting Chief, Vital Records
Management
State Department of Health
79 Elm Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06115
203/566-3149

Mr. Everett H. Williams, Jr.
Chief, Bureau of Vital Statistics
Department of Health and Rehabilitative
Services
P.O. Box 210
Jacksonville, Florida 32201
904/354-3961, Ext. 245 & 246

Mr. George H. Tokuyama
State Registrar and Assistant Chief
Research and Statistics Office
Hawaii Department of Health
P.O. Box 3378
Honolulu, Hawaii 96801
808/548-5820

Mr. Stanley Miles
Deputy State Registrar
Illinois Department of Public Health
535 West Jefferson Street
Springfield, Illinois 62761
217/782-2283

Mr. Robert R. Lewis
State Registrar and Director
Division of Vital Records
State Board of Health
1330 West Michigan Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206

Mr. Herbert E. Risser
Acting State Registrar of Vital
Statistics
Division of Vital Statistics
Room 272, State House
Boston, Massachusetts 02133
617/727-2838

Mr. George Van Amburg
Registrar and Chief
Vital Records Section
Center for Health Statistics
Michigan Department of Public
Health
3500 North Logan Street
Lansing, Michigan 48914
517/373-6527

Mr. Charles A. Karbut
Acting Chief, Vital Statistics
and Registration
Division of Administration
State Department of Health
P.O. Box 1540
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
609/292-4087

Mr. Vito Logrillo
Director of Health Statistics
New York State Department of
Health
Empire State Plaza
Tower Building, Room 303
Albany, New York 12237
518/474-8260

Mr. Irving Mellon
Director, Bureau of Vital Records
The City of New York
Department of Health
125 Worth Street
New York, New York 10013
212/566-8193

1975 Directory Continued

Mr. Karl Wise
Chief, Division of Vital Statistics
Ohio Department of Health
450 East Town Street
P.O. Box 118
Columbus, Ohio 43216
614/466-2533

Mr. Charles Hardester
State Registrar and Acting Director
Division of Vital Statistics
Pennsylvania Department of Health
P.O. Box 1528
Central Building
101 S. Mercer Street
New Castle, Pennsylvania 16103
412/658-2601

Mr. W. D. Carroll
Chief, Records and Statistics Section
and State Registrar
State Department of Health
410 East Fifth Street
Austin, Texas 78701
512/472-8431, Ext. 401, 402

Raymond D. Nashold, Ph.D.
Director, Bureau of Health Statistics
Department of Health and Social Services
Division of Health
P.O. Box 309
Madison, Wisconsin 53701
608/266-1939

APPENDIX E

Aspira of America
22 East 54th Street
New York, New York 10022
(212) 688-7414

Puerto Rican Educational Profiles Study
Questionnaire

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

- A. Name of City _____
- B. Name of Superintendent of Schools _____
- C. Address of Board of Education _____

- D. Telephone number _____
- E. Names and titles of persons completing questionnaire _____

Instructions

Insert the information requested for each question in the provided space. However, if an answer to a question can be found in documents or materials already prepared by your school system, then simply attach the materials to the page and leave the space blank. If for any reason you can not answer a question, then please insert your reason in lieu of an answer in the provided space. Please return this questionnaire to the above address as soon as conveniently possible after completion. Thank you.

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS

A. ETHNIC/RACIAL DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS

What was the ethnic/racial distribution in numbers of your student population for the following school years?

	1969-70	1975-76
Total	_____	_____
White (non-Hispanic)	_____	_____
Black (non-Hispanic)	_____	_____
Puerto Rican	_____	_____
Other Hispanic	_____	_____
Asian American	_____	_____
American Indian	_____	_____

B. HISPANIC DISTRIBUTION IN STUDENT POPULATION

What was the distribution in numbers of Puerto Rican and other Hispanic students by grade level?

<u>Level</u>	1969-70			1975-76		
	<u>Total student enrollment</u>	<u>P.R.</u>	<u>other Hispanic</u>	<u>Total student enrollment</u>	<u>P.R.</u>	<u>other Hispanic</u>
Elem. Schools (to _____ grade)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
JHS-Int. Schools (to _____ grade)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Academic HS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Vocational HS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Special Schools (Define)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
and/or comprehensive high schools	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Grand Total	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

II. C. 1. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF HISPANIC STUDENTS

1. a. What was the geographic distribution of Hispanic and Puerto Rican students by school district and location in 1969-70.

<u>School District Number</u>	<u>Location of District by Name of Neighborhood (s)</u>	<u>Total Number of Schools in District</u>	<u>Number of Hispanic Students</u>	<u>% of District Total</u>	<u>Number of P.R.</u>	<u>% of District Total</u>
---------------------------------------	---	--	--	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------------

II. C. 1. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF HISPANIC STUDENTS

1. b. What was the geographic distribution of Hispanic and Puerto Rican students by school district and location in 1975-76.

<u>School District Number</u>	<u>Location of District by Name of Neighborhood (s)</u>	<u>Total Number of Schools in District</u>	<u>Number of Hispanic Students</u>	<u>% of District Total</u>	<u>Number of P.R.</u>	<u>% of District Total</u>
---------------------------------------	---	--	--	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------------

C. 2. CONCENTRATION OF HISPANIC AND PUERTO RICAN STUDENTS

- 2a. List name or identifying number (e.g., P.S. 141) of all schools with a proportion of 5% or more Hispanic students in 1969-70: Also, include the total number of all students, of Hispanic students, of Puerto Rican students by such individual schools.

<u>Name or Identifying Number of School</u>	<u>District Number</u>	<u>Total Number of all Students</u>	<u>Total # of Hispanic Students</u>	<u>Total # Puerto Rican Students</u>
---	----------------------------	---	---	--

C. 2. CONCENTRATION OF HISPANIC AND PUERTO RICAN STUDENTS

- 2b. List name or identifying number (e.g., P.S. 141) of all schools with a proportion of 5% or more Hispanic students in 1975-76: Also, include the total number of all students, of Hispanic students, of Puerto Rican students by such individual schools.

<u>Name or Identifying Number of School</u>	<u>District Number</u>	<u>Total Number of all Students</u>	<u>Total # of Hispanic Students</u>	<u>Total # Puerto Rican Students</u>
---	----------------------------	---	---	--

C. 3. RACIAL INTEGRATION PLAN AND DISPERSION OF STUDENTS.

- a. What was the percentage of total student population transported to schools outside their own immediate neighborhood for the purposes of fulfilling a racial integration plan?

1969-70 _____ %

1975-76 _____ %

- b. What was the percentage of Hispanic/Puerto Rican student population transported?

1969-70 _____ %

1975-76 _____ %

- c. Are Hispanic students divided into racial categories for the purpose of fulfilling the goals of a racial integration plan?

Yes _____ No _____

- D. Is this a court mandated integration plan?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments:

D. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

1. Failure rates

- a. What is the percentage of the total student population that failed to progress to the next higher grade?

1969-70 _____% 1975-76 _____%

- b. What is the percentage of the Hispanic (and Puerto Rican) portion of the student population that failed to progress to the next higher grade?

1969-70 _____% 1975-76 _____%

2. Retention Rates

What are the percentages of those students by sex that did not graduate from high school in the listed school years among students who did complete at least the ninth grade? If your rates are based on another definition, please specify it.

- a. for total student population

	Total	Male	Female
1969-70	_____%	_____%	_____%
1971-72	_____%	_____%	_____%
1975-76	_____%	_____%	_____%

- b. for Hispanic (and Puerto Rican) population

1969-70	_____%	_____%	_____%
1971-72	_____%	_____%	_____%
1975-76	_____%	_____%	_____%

- c. What is the age in your state at which a student can legally leave the schooling system and not have to attend any school?

_____ years.

3. What are the percentages of graduated students requesting transcripts of high school credits for application to college admission?

- a. for total students

1969-70 _____%

1975-76 _____%

- b. for Hispanic (and Puerto Rican) students.

1969-70 _____%

1975-76 _____%

E. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

1. Please list the names of the standardized achievement tests used by your system to measure academic achievement in reading and mathematics.

Reading: _____

Mathematics: _____

Are non-English speaking students excluded from taking these tests? _____

2. What were the state-wide averages on the reading and mathematics test?

	Reading	Mathematics
1969-70	_____	_____
1975-76	_____	_____

3. List the city-wide percentages of children at or above grade level for the different racial/ethnic groups listed for the 1969-70 and 1975-76 school years.

	Reading		Mathematics	
	1969-70	1975-76	1969-70	1975-76
Total system	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %
White	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %
Black	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %
Puerto Rican	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %
Other Hispanic	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %
Asian American	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %
American Indian	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %

E. 4. a. List the percentages of students at or above grade level in reading and mathematics by individual school and district for the 1969-1970 school year.

- E. 4. b. List the percentages of students at or above grade level in reading and mathematics by individual school and district for the 1975-1976 school year.

F. USE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE BY HISPANIC AND PUERTO RICAN STUDENTS WITH A SPANISH LANGUAGE BACKGROUND.

List the results of any language survey or census that identified and categorized Hispanic and Puerto Rican students from a Spanish-speaking background by ability to function in the English language for the school years 1969-1970 and 1975-1976.

Note: Because of the lack of standardization in instruments used to measure the abilities of a student to use English, please attach a copy of the instrument used by your system.

2. a. Did the school system have any bilingual programs for Spanish speaking students?

	1969-70	1975-76
Yes	_____	_____
No	_____	_____

- b. What percentage of Spanish-speaking children assessed as needing bilingual programs participated in such programs?

1969-70 _____ %

1975-76 _____ %

- c. Were any of the bilingual programs for the Spanish speaking mandated by the courts?

	1969-70	1975-76
Yes	_____	_____
No	_____	_____

- d. Of all the students that participated in bilingual programs for the Spanish speaking what percentage were in court mandated programs?

1969-70 _____ %

1975-76 _____ %

- e. List the amount and the source of funds used for bilingual programs and the number of students that participated in such programs in your school system in 1969-70 and 1975-76.

	<u>Name of Program</u>	<u>Amount of funds</u>	<u>Source of funds</u>	<u>Number of participating students</u>
1969-1970:	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
1975-1976:	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____

G. TRANSFERS

List the number of transfers of students between Puerto Rico as well as New York City and your City for the following years.

<u>School Year</u>	<u>Came from Puerto Rico</u>	<u>Came from New York City</u>	<u>Moved to Puerto Rico</u>	<u>Net Transfers from all points to your city</u>
1968-69	_____	_____	_____	_____
1969-70	_____	_____	_____	_____
1970-71	_____	_____	_____	_____
1971-72	_____	_____	_____	_____
1972-73	_____	_____	_____	_____
1973-74	_____	_____	_____	_____
1974-75	_____	_____	_____	_____
1975-76	_____	_____	_____	_____

III. STAFF

- A. List the number of staff in each of the following categories by school years.

1969-70			1975-76	
<u>Job Category</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Spanish Surnamed</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Spanish Surnamed</u>
Principals.....				
Assistant Principals.....				
Teachers.....				
Other professional staff...				
Other instructional staff... (define)				
Paraprofessional staff...				
Full-time clerical office staff...				
Part-time professional staff.....				

- B. What was the system-wide percentage of teachers in regular teaching positions who did not have regular licenses or teaching certificates?

1969-1970 _____ %

1975-1976 _____ %

- C. What was the teacher-pupil ratio for the school system?

1969-1970 _____

1975-1976 _____

IV. POLICY MAKING BODY

A. COMPOSITION

What was the ethnic/racial composition of your School Board or governing body by year?

	<u>Total</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Puerto Rican</u>	<u>Other Hispanic</u>
1969-70	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
1975-76	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

B. SELECTION

1. Check off what was the method of selection for this governing body.

	1969-70	1969-70	1975-76
a. election to an at-large post		_____	_____
b. election from political sub-divisions		_____	_____
c. appointment		_____	_____
d. other		_____	_____

2. If selection of the governing body is by appointment, what procedures are followed in the appointment process?

V. FISCAL

A. OPERATING EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL

1. What was the average operating expenditures per pupil, excluding Federal funds, for your city?

1969-70 \$ _____

1975-76 \$ _____

2. What was the average operating expenditures per pupil, excluding Federal funds, for your metropolitan area?

1969-70 \$ _____

1975-76 \$ _____

3. What was the average operating expenditure per pupil, excluding Federal funds, for your state?

1969-70 \$ _____

1975-76 \$ _____

4. What were the proportions of your state's contribution to the total non-federal school revenues for operating expenditures in your city?

1969-70 _____ %

1975-76 _____ %

B. ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS

1. What percentages of all students participated in ESEA Title I programs?

1969-70 _____ %

1975-76 _____ %

2. What were the actual amounts of Title I revenue to your city?

1969-70 \$ _____

1975-76 \$ _____

C. PROPERTY TAX RATES

1. What were the property tax rates, expressed as amounts per \$100.00 of market valuation of property, for all public services in your city?

1969-70 \$ _____ 1975-76 \$ _____

2. What were the property tax rates, expressed as amounts per \$100.00 of market valuation of property, for education?

1969-70 \$ _____ 1975-76 \$ _____

3. Is your school system or city government involved in any litigation over formulas of state aid to your schools?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments:

VI. SCHOOL SYSTEM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND PROBLEMS

A. In general, what have been some of the accomplishments of your school system during the past few years?

B. In general, what have been some of the problems confronting your school system during the past few years?